

Pattern Containment and Combinatorial Inequalities

Alexander I. Burstein
 Department of Mathematics
 Iowa State University
 Ames, IA 50011-2064
 burstein@math.iastate.edu

February 1, 2008

Abstract

We use a probabilistic method to produce some combinatorial inequalities by considering pattern containment in permutations and words.

If $\sigma \in S_n$ and $\tau \in S_m$, we say that σ *contains* τ , or τ *occurs* in σ , if σ has a subsequence order-isomorphic to τ . In this situation, τ is called a *pattern*. Similarly, if $\sigma \in [k]^n$ is a string of n letters over the alphabet $[k] = \{1, \dots, k\}$, and $\tau \in [l]^m$ is a map from $[m]$ onto $[l]$ (i.e. τ contains all letters from 1 to l), then we say that σ contains the pattern τ if σ has a subsequence order-isomorphic to τ . An *instance* (or *occurrence*) of τ in σ is a choice of m positions $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_m \leq n$, such that the subsequence $(\sigma(i_1), \dots, \sigma(i_m))$ is order-isomorphic to $\tau = (\tau(1), \dots, \tau(m))$.

Most of the work on pattern containment concentrated on pattern avoidance, that is on characterizing and counting permutations that contain no occurrences of a given pattern or a set of patterns. Less attention has been given to counting the number of times a given pattern occurs in permutations of a given size, in particular, packing patterns into permutations (but see [1, 4], for example), and, to our knowledge, packing patterns into words (where repeated letters are allowed) has not yet been considered.

Here we consider pattern containment and use a simple probabilistic fact (the variance of a random variable is nonnegative) to produce nontrivial combinatorial inequalities.

1 Patterns in permutations

In this section, we consider permutation patterns contained in other permutations.

Theorem 1 Let τ be a permutation of $\{0, 1, \dots, m\}$ and define

$$[i, j]_m = \binom{i+j}{i} \binom{2m-i-j}{m-i}.$$

Then for any nonnegative integer m and any τ as above,

$$\sum_{i,j=0}^m [i, j]_m [\tau(i), \tau(j)]_m \geq \binom{2m+1}{m}^2. \quad (1)$$

Remark 1 Notice that $[i, j]_m$ is the number of northeast integer lattice paths from $(0, 0)$ to (m, m) through (i, j) . Hence the left-hand side is the number of pairs (P, Q) of northeast integer lattice paths $P : (0, 0) \rightarrow (i, j) \rightarrow (m, m)$ and $Q : (0, 0) \rightarrow (\tau(i), \tau(j)) \rightarrow (m, m)$ over all $(i, j) \in [0, m]^2$.

Remark 2 The numbers $[i, j]_m$, $0 \leq i, j \leq m$ have been found to have other interesting properties as well. For example, Amdeberhan and Ekhad [2] showed that

$$\det([i, j]_m)_{0 \leq i, j \leq m} = \frac{(2m+1)!^{m+1}}{(2m+1)!!},$$

where $a!! = 0! \cdot 1! \cdot 2! \cdot \dots \cdot a!$.

It is a well-known result [3] that for any nondecreasing subsequence $a_1 \geq \dots \geq a_n$ and a permutation $\varphi \in S_n$, the sum $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i a_{\varphi(i)}$ attains its maximum when $\varphi = id_n = 12 \dots n$ and its minimum when $\varphi = n(n-1) \dots 1$. Now if we arrange $(m+1)^2$ numbers $[i, j]_m$ ($0 \leq i, j \leq m$) in nondecreasing order, *there is no permutation τ of $\{0, 1, \dots, m\}$ which reverses that order* (other than in the trivial case $m = 0$). For example, even when $m = 1$, we have

$$[0, 0]_2 = [1, 1]_2 = 2 > 1 = [0, 1]_2 = [1, 0]_2,$$

reversing $(2, 2, 1, 1)$ gives $(1, 1, 2, 2)$ and the estimate of [3] gives us the lower bound of $2 \cdot 1 + 2 \cdot 1 + 1 \cdot 2 + 1 \cdot 2 = 8$, our estimate yields the lower bound of $\binom{3}{1}^2 = 9$, while the left hand side is actually equal to 10 for both $\tau = 01$ (the identity) and $\tau = 10$ (which transposes $[0, 0]_2$ and $[1, 1]_2$ as well as $[0, 1]_2$ and $[1, 0]_2$ in the above ordering).

The estimate in Theorem 1 appears to be stronger than that of [3]. For example, the lower bounds for $m = 2, 3, 4, 5$ are 75, 792, 8660, 98876, respectively, according to [3], while our lower bounds are 100, 1225, 15876, 213444, respectively. In fact, as the following proposition shows, the lower bound of [3] can never be achieved in our case for $m > 0$.

Proposition 1 Arrange $(m+1)^2$ numbers $\{[i, j]_m \mid 0 \leq i, j \leq m\}$ into a nondecreasing order $a_1 \geq \dots \geq a_{(m+1)^2}$. A permutation τ of $\{0, 1, \dots, m\}$ induces an equivalence class of permutations φ_τ on the a_i 's (equivalence relation being a permutation of equal elements). Then for any τ , reversal of the identity $(m+1)^2((m+1)^2 - 1) \dots 21 \notin \varphi_\tau$.

Proof. Suppose that there is a permutation τ which induces an order-reversing permutation of the a_i 's. Note that $[0, m]_m = [m, 0]_m = 1$ for any m , hence, $[\tau(0), \tau(m)]_m$ must have the greatest value among all $[\tau(i), \tau(j)]_m$. Note that

$$[i, j]_m = [j, i]_m = [m - i, m - j]_m = [m - j, m - i]_m$$

for any i and j , so assume that $i \leq j$. Then it is a straightforward exercise to prove that

$$\begin{aligned} [i, j]_m &> [i - 1, j]_m \quad \text{for } i > 0, \text{ and} \\ [i, j]_m &> [i, j + 1]_m \quad \text{for } j < m, \end{aligned}$$

so for $0 < i < j < m$,

$$[i, i]_m > [i, j]_m > [0, j]_m > [0, m]_m = 1.$$

Similarly, we can assume that $i \leq \lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor$ (since $[i, i]_m = [m - i, m - i]_m$), then it is just as easy to see that for any $i > 0$

$$[i, i]_m < [i - 1, i - 1]_m < \cdots < [0, 0]_m = \binom{2m}{m}.$$

Thus, for any $0 \leq i, j \leq m$,

$$1 = [0, m]_m = [m, 0]_m \leq [i, j]_m \leq [0, 0]_m = [m, m]_m = \binom{2m}{m},$$

and one of the two inequalities becomes an equality if and only if $i, j \in \{0, m\}$. Hence, for our permutation τ , we must have $\tau(0) = \tau(m) = 0$ or $\tau(0) = \tau(m) = m$, neither of which is possible when $m \neq 0$. The resulting contradiction implies our proposition. $\square$

Finally, before we begin with the proof of Theorem 1, let us note that a permutation of summands in (1) yields the following corollary.

Corollary 1 *For any two permutations τ_1, τ_2 of $\{0, 1, \dots, m\}$ and any $m \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\sum_{i,j=0}^m [\tau_1(i), \tau_1(j)]_m [\tau_2(i), \tau_2(j)]_m \geq \binom{2m+1}{m}^2.$$

Another immediate corollary is a consequence of the fact that

$$[i, j]_m = \binom{2m}{m} \frac{\binom{m}{i} \binom{m}{j}}{\binom{2m}{i+j}} = \binom{2m}{m} \{i, j\}_m, \text{ where } \{i, j\}_m := \frac{\binom{m}{i} \binom{m}{j}}{\binom{2m}{i+j}}.$$

Corollary 2 *For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and any permutation τ of $\{0, 1, \dots, m\}$,*

$$\sum_{i,j=0}^m \{i, j\}_m \{\tau(i), \tau(j)\}_m \geq \left(\frac{2m+1}{m+1} \right)^2 = \left(2 - \frac{1}{m+1} \right)^2.$$

Note that Corollary 2 no longer holds if we substitute 4 on the right side of this inequality.

Proof of Theorem 1. Consider S_n as a sample space with uniform distribution. Let $\tau \in S_m$ (notation-wise, it is more convenient if, in the proof, τ is a permutation of $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$), and let X_τ be a random variable such that $X_\tau(\sigma)$ is the number of occurrences of pattern τ in given permutation $\sigma \in S_n$. We will show that our inequality follows from the fact that

$$\text{Var}(X_\tau) = E(X_\tau^2) - E(X_\tau)^2 \geq 0$$

We start by finding $E(X_\tau)$. Pick an m -letter subset S of $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ in $\binom{n}{m}$ ways. There is a unique permutation $\tau(S)$ of S which is order-isomorphic to τ . There are $m!$ equally likely permutations in which the elements of S can occur in σ , but we need only 1 of them, namely, $\tau(S)$. Hence, $\tau(S)$ either occurs once or does not occur in a given permutation σ . Therefore, the probability that a random σ contains $\tau(S)$ as a subsequence is $1/m!$. Let $Y_{\tau(S)}$ be a random variable such that $Y_{\tau(S)}(\sigma)$ is the number of occurrences of $\tau(S)$ in σ . Since

$$P(Y_{\tau(S)}(\sigma) = 1) = \frac{1}{m!} \quad \text{and} \quad P(Y_{\tau(S)}(\sigma) = 0) = 1 - \frac{1}{m!},$$

we have $E(Y_{\tau(S)}) = 1/m!$. But this is true for any $S \subseteq [n]$ such that $|S| = m$, and we have

$$X_\tau = \sum_{S \subseteq [n], |S|=m} Y_{\tau(S)}$$

hence,

$$E(X_\tau) = \sum_{S \subseteq [n], |S|=m} E(Y_{\tau(S)}) = \frac{1}{m!} \binom{n}{m}.$$

Next, we look at $E(X_\tau^2)$. We have

$$E(X_\tau^2) = E \left(\sum_{S \subseteq [n], |S|=m} Y_{\tau(S)} \right) = \sum_{\substack{S_1, S_2 \subseteq [n] \\ |S_1|=|S_2|=m}} E(Y_{\tau(S_1)} Y_{\tau(S_2)}).$$

Of course, $Y_{\tau(S_1)} Y_{\tau(S_2)} = 1$ if and only if both $\tau(S_1)$ and $\tau(S_2)$ are subsequences of σ , otherwise, $Y_{\tau(S_1)} Y_{\tau(S_2)} = 0$.

Let $S = S_1 \cup S_2$, and $|S_1 \cap S_2| = \ell$, so $|S| = |S_1 \cup S_2| = 2m - \ell$. We can pick a subset $S \subseteq [n]$ in $\binom{n}{2m-\ell}$ ways. Note that any such S is order-isomorphic to $[2m - \ell] = \{1, 2, \dots, 2m - \ell\}$. Therefore, the number of permutations $\rho(S)$ of S such that $\rho(S) = \tau(S_1) \cup \tau(S_2)$ for some $S_1, S_2 \subseteq S$, $S_1 \cup S_2 = S$, is the same for any S of cardinality $2m - \ell$ and depends only on m and ℓ .

Therefore, $E(X_\tau^2)$ is a linear combination of $\left\{ \binom{n}{2m-\ell} \mid 0 \leq \ell \leq m \right\}$ with coefficients which are rational functions of m and ℓ . The degrees in n of both

$E(X_\tau^2)$ and $E(X_\tau)^2$ are $2m$, and the coefficient of n^{2m} in $E(X_\tau)^2$ is $1/(m!)^4$. On the other hand, $S = S_1 \cup S_2$, $|S| = 2m$ and $|S_1| = |S_2| = m$ imply that $S_1 \cap S_2 = \emptyset$, so $Y_{\tau(S_1)}$ and $Y_{\tau(S_2)}$ are independent, and hence

$$P(Y_{\tau(S_1)}Y_{\tau(S_2)} = 1) = P(Y_{\tau(S_1)} = 1)P(Y_{\tau(S_2)} = 1) = \left(\frac{1}{m!}\right)^2.$$

Since the number of ways to partition a set S of size $2m$ into two subsets of size m is $\binom{2m}{m}$, the coefficient of $\binom{n}{2m}$ in $E(X_\tau^2)$ is $\binom{2m}{m}/(m!)^2$. Hence, the coefficient of n^{2m} in $E(X_\tau^2)$ is

$$[n^{2m}]E(X_\tau^2) = \frac{1}{(2m)!} \cdot \frac{1}{(m!)^2} \binom{2m}{m} = \frac{1}{(m!)^4},$$

where $[x^d]P(x)$ denotes the coefficient of x^d in a given polynomial $P(x)$. But then $[n^{2m}]E(X_\tau^2) = [n^{2m}]E(X_\tau)^2$, so $\deg_n(\text{Var}(X_\tau)) \leq 2m - 1$, and hence, $[n^{2m-1}]\text{Var}(X_\tau) \geq 0$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned} [n^{2m-1}]E(X_\tau)^2 &= [n^{2m-1}] \left(\frac{1}{m!} \binom{n}{m} \right)^2 = \\ &= \frac{2}{(m!)^2} \cdot [n^m] \binom{n}{m} \cdot [n^{m-1}] \binom{n}{m} = \\ &= \frac{2}{(m!)^2} \cdot \frac{1}{m!} \cdot \left(-\frac{\binom{m}{2}}{m!} \right) = -\frac{m(m-1)}{(m!)^4} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the coefficient of n^{2m-1} in the $\binom{n}{2m}$ -term of $E(X_\tau^2)$ is

$$-\frac{\binom{2m}{2}}{(2m)!} \frac{1}{(m!)^2} \binom{2m}{m} = -\frac{m(2m-1)}{(m!)^4},$$

so we only need to find the coefficient of the $\binom{n}{2m-1}$ -term of $E(X_\tau^2)$.

As we noted before, all subsets $S \subseteq [n]$ of the same size (in our case, of size $2m-1$) are equivalent, so we may assume $S = [2m-1] = \{1, 2, \dots, 2m-1\}$. We want to find the number of permutations ρ of S such that there exist subsets $S_1, S_2 \subseteq S$ of size m for which we have $|S_1 \cap S_2| = 1$ (so $S_1 \cup S_2 = S$) and $\rho(S) = \tau(S_1) \cup \tau(S_2)$.

Suppose that we want to choose S_1 and S_2 as above, together with their positions in S , in such a way that the intersection element e is in the i th position in $\tau(S_1)$ and the j th position in $\tau(S_2)$ (of course, $1 \leq i, j \leq m$). Then e occupies position $(i-1) + (j-1) + 1 = i+j-1$ in S . Hence, there are $\binom{i-1+j-1}{i-1}$ ways to choose the positions for elements of $\tau(S_1)$ and $\tau(S_2)$ on the left of e , and $\binom{m-i+m-j}{m-j}$ ways to choose the positions for elements of $\tau(S_1)$ and $\tau(S_2)$ on the right of e . On the other hand, both $\tau(S_1)$ and $\tau(S_2)$ are naturally order-isomorphic to τ , hence, under that isomorphism e maps to $\tau(i)$ as an element of

S_1 and to $\tau(j)$ as an element of S_2 . Since e is the *unique* intersection element, it is easy to see that we must have $e = (\tau(i) - 1) + (\tau(j) - 1) + 1 = \tau(i) + \tau(j) - 1$ (exactly $\tau(i) - 1$ elements in S_1 and exactly $\tau(j) - 1$ elements in S_2 , all distinct from those in S_1 , must be less than e , the rest of the elements of S must be greater than e). There are $\binom{\tau(i)-1+\tau(j)-1}{\tau(i)-1}$ ways to choose the elements of S_1 and S_2 which are less than e , and $\binom{m-\tau(i)+m-\tau(j)}{m-\tau(j)}$ ways to choose the elements of S_1 and S_2 which are greater than e .

Thus, its positions in $\tau(S_1)$ and $\tau(S_2)$ uniquely determine the position and value of the intersection element e ; there are $[i - 1, j - 1]_m$ ways to choose which other positions are occupied by $\tau(S_1)$ and which ones by $\tau(S_2)$; and, there are $[\tau(i) - 1, \tau(j) - 1]_m$ ways to choose which other values are in $\tau(S_1)$ and which ones are in $\tau(S_2)$.

Now that we have chosen both positions and values of elements of S_1 and S_2 , we can produce a unique permutation $\rho(S)$ of S which satisfies our conditions above. Simply fill the positions for S_1 , resp. S_2 , by elements of $\tau(S_1)$, resp. $\tau(S_2)$, in the order in which they occur.

Since the total number of permutations of S is $(2m - 1)!$, the coefficient of the $\binom{n}{2m-1}$ -term of $E(X_\tau^2)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sum_{i,j=1}^m \binom{i-1+j-1}{i-1} \binom{m-i+m-j}{m-j} \binom{\tau(i)-1+\tau(j)-1}{\tau(i)-1} \binom{m-\tau(i)+m-\tau(j)}{m-\tau(j)}}{(2m-1)!} = \\ & = \frac{\sum_{i,j=1}^m [i-1, j-1]_{m-1} [\tau(i)-1, \tau(j)-1]_{m-1}}{(2m-1)!}, \end{aligned}$$

the coefficient of n^{2m-1} in $\text{Var}(X_\tau)$ is, by the previous equations,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sum_{i,j=1}^m [i-1, j-1]_{m-1} [\tau(i)-1, \tau(j)-1]_{m-1}}{((2m-1)!)^2} - \frac{m(2m-1)}{(m!)^4} + \frac{m(m-1)}{(m!)^4} = \\ & = \frac{\sum_{i,j=1}^m [i-1, j-1]_{m-1} [\tau(i)-1, \tau(j)-1]_{m-1}}{((2m-1)!)^2} - \frac{1}{(m!(m-1)!)^2} \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

so we finally get

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^m [i-1, j-1]_{m-1} [\tau(i)-1, \tau(j)-1]_{m-1} \geq \left(\frac{(2m-1)!}{m!(m-1)!} \right)^2 = \binom{2m-1}{m-1}^2,$$

which is easily reducible to (1) by $m \leftarrow m + 1$, then $\bar{\tau}(i) \leftarrow \tau(i + 1) - 1$. $\square$

It seems, however, that a stronger form of our Theorem should be true, namely, the following

Conjecture 1 *The strict inequality holds in (1) for all $m > 0$.*

This would imply that $\text{Var}(X_\tau)$ has order $2m - 1$ in n , i.e. the standard deviation of X_τ is $1/2$ order smaller than its expected value.

Remark 3 Similarly, the leading coefficient of the covariance $Cov(X_{\tau_1}, X_{\tau_2})$ is

$$\frac{\sum_{i,j=1}^m [i-1, j-1]_{m-1} [\tau_1(i)-1, \tau_2(j)-1]_{m-1}}{((2m-1)!)^2} - \frac{1}{(m!(m-1)!)^2},$$

but $\sum_{i,j=1}^m [i-1, j-1]_{m-1} [\tau_1(i)-1, \tau_2(j)-1]_{m-1}$ can be (and often is) less than $\binom{2m-1}{m-1}^2$.

As of now, we only have some results on the sign of covariance for small patterns. We hope to explore this topic further in subsequent papers.

Note that the reversal map, $\tau(i) \mapsto \tau(m+1-i)$, the complement map, $\tau(i) \mapsto m+1-\tau(i)$, preserve the variance and covariance (we also make a note for the next section that, for words $\tau \in [l]^m$, the reversal map is the same, while the complement is $\tau(i) \mapsto l+1-\tau(i)$).

Considering symmetry classes of pairs of patterns (i.e. equivalence classes with respect to reversal and complement), we see that there are 8 classes of pairs of 3-letter patterns: $\{123, 123\}$, $\{132, 132\}$, $\{123, 132\}$, $\{132, 213\}$, $\{132, 231\}$, $\{132, 312\}$, $\{123, 312\}$, $\{123, 321\}$ (listed in order of decreasing covariance). Of those, the first two pairs obviously have a positive covariance, and of the remaining six, only $\{123, 132\}$ has a positive covariance.

Finally, denote the left-hand side and right-hand side of equation (1) by $L(m, \tau)$ and $R(m, \tau)$, respectively, and let

$$M^*(m) = \max_{\tau \in S_m} (L(m, \tau) - R(m, \tau)),$$

$$M_*(m) = \min_{\tau \in S_m} (L(m, \tau) - R(m, \tau)).$$

It is not hard to see that $M^*(m) = L(m, id_m) - R(m, id_m) > 0$, where id_m is the identity permutation of $\{0, 1, \dots, m\}$ (use Chebyshev's inequality, or dot product, or Cauchy-Schwarz inequality). It would be interesting to characterize the permutations $\tilde{\tau}_m$ such that $M_*(m) = L(m, \tilde{\tau}_m) - R(m, \tilde{\tau}_m)$. We also make the following conjecture.

Conjecture 2 $\exists \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{M_*(m)}{M^*(m)} = 0$.

2 Patterns in words

We now consider patterns contained in words, where repeated letters are allowed both in the pattern and the ambient string.

Theorem 2 Let τ be a map of $[0, m] = \{0, 1, \dots, m\}$ onto $[0, l] = \{0, 1, \dots, l\}$. Then for any nonnegative integers $0 \leq l \leq m$ and any τ as above,

$$\sum_{i,j=0}^m [i, j]_m [\tau(i), \tau(j)]_l \geq \frac{(2m+1)!(2l+1)!}{(m!)^2(l+1)!^2}. \quad (2)$$

Remark 4 Note that Theorem 2 reduces to Theorem 1 when $l = m$. Note also that, given $0 \leq l \leq m$, Theorem 2 applies to $(l+1)!S(m+1, l+1)$ patterns τ , where $S(m+1, l+1)$ is the Stirling number of the second kind.

Remark 5 As in Theorem 1, the left-hand side of Theorem 2 is the number of pairs (P, Q) of northeast integer lattice paths $P : (0, 0) \rightarrow (i, j) \rightarrow (m, m)$ and $Q : (0, 0) \rightarrow (\tau(i), \tau(j)) \rightarrow (l, l)$ over all $(i, j) \in [0, m]^2$.

Proof of Theorem 2. The proof follows the same outline as that of Theorem 1, so we will use the same notation as well. Again, it will be convenient to assume in the proof that $\tau \in [l]^m$ is map of $[m]$ onto $[l]$ (i.e. use $\{1, \dots, m\}$ instead of $\{0, 1, \dots, m\}$ and $\{1, \dots, l\}$ instead of $\{0, 1, \dots, l\}$) and, similarly, that the ambient permutations $\sigma \in [k]^n$. Note that for any subset $S \subseteq [n]$ of positions, the probability that the subsequence of elements at positions in S , i.e. $\sigma(S)$, in a random word $\sigma \in [k]^n$, is order-isomorphic to τ is $\binom{k}{l}/k^m$. This is because k^m is the total number of subsequences of m letters in $[k]$, τ has exactly l distinct letters, and there are $\binom{k}{l}$ ways to choose l distinct letters out of k . Hence, as in Theorem 1, we obtain

$$E(X_\tau) = \frac{1}{k^m} \binom{k}{l} \binom{n}{m},$$

which is a polynomial in n and k . Therefore, the leading coefficient of $E(X_\tau)$ as a polynomial in n is

$$[n^m]E(X_\tau) = \frac{1}{k^m} \binom{k}{l} \frac{1}{m!},$$

so the leading coefficient of $E(X_\tau)^2$ is

$$[n^{2m}]E(X_\tau)^2 = \frac{1}{k^{2m}} \binom{k}{l}^2 \frac{1}{(m!)^2}.$$

However, as in the proof of Theorem 1, we have that $E(X_\tau^2)$ is a linear combination of $\binom{n}{2m-\ell}$, $0 \leq \ell \leq m$, with coefficients being polynomials in k and rational functions in l, m . A similar analysis shows that the leading coefficient in n of $E(X_\tau^2)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} [n^{2m}]E(X_\tau^2) &= \frac{1}{(2m)!} \left[\binom{n}{2m} \right] E(X_\tau^2) = \\ &= \frac{1}{(2m)!} \binom{2m}{m} \binom{k}{l}^2 \frac{1}{k^{2m}} = [n^{2m}]E(X_\tau)^2, \end{aligned}$$

so $\deg_n(\text{Var}(X_\tau)) \leq 2m - 1$, and hence, $[n^{2m-1}]\text{Var}(X_\tau) \geq 0$.

As in the proof of Theorem 1, we have that

$$[n^{2m-1}]E(X_\tau)^2 = 2[n^{m-1}]E(X_\tau)[n^m]E(X_\tau) = -\frac{m(m-1)}{(m!)^2} \binom{k}{l}^2 \frac{1}{k^{2m}}$$

and the coefficient of n^{2m-1} in the $\binom{n}{2m}$ -term of $E(X_\tau^2)$ is

$$-\binom{2m}{2} \frac{1}{(2m)!} \binom{2m}{m} \binom{k}{l}^2 \frac{1}{k^{2m}} = -\frac{m(2m-1)}{(m!)^2} \binom{k}{l}^2 \frac{1}{k^{2m}}.$$

The remaining summand in $[n^{2m-1}]Var(X_\tau)$ is the coefficient of n^{2m-1} in the $\binom{n}{2m-1}$ -term of $E(X_\tau^2)$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{(2m-1)!} \left[\binom{n}{2m-1} \right] E(X_\tau^2) \\ & - \frac{m(2m-1)}{(m!)^2} \binom{k}{l}^2 \frac{1}{k^{2m}} + \frac{m(m-1)}{(m!)^2} \binom{k}{l}^2 \frac{1}{k^{2m}} \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\left[\binom{n}{2m-1} \right] E(X_\tau^2) \geq \frac{(2m-1)!}{(m-1)!^2} \binom{k}{l}^2 \frac{1}{k^{2m}}.$$

As in the proof of Theorem 1, it is easy to see that $[\binom{n}{2m-1}]E(X_\tau^2)$ is equal to the probability that a sequence $\rho \in [k]^{2m-1}$ is a union of two subsequences order-isomorphic to τ . Therefore, assume $[2m-1] = S_1 \cup S_2$, $\rho(S_1) \cong \tau \cong \rho(S_2)$. But then S_1 and S_2 have m elements, so they intersect at a single element e .

Suppose that e is at position i in S_1 and at position j in S_2 . Then, as in the proof of Theorem 1, there are $\binom{i-1+j-1}{i-1} \binom{m-i+m-j}{m-i} = [i-1, j-1]_{m-1}$ ways to choose which positions to the left and to the right of e are in S_1 and which ones are in S_2 .

Suppose that ρ contains $l+L$ distinct letters, then $0 \leq L \leq l-1$. Because of the positions of e in S_1 and S_2 , we know that e must map to $\tau(i)$ in $\rho(S_1)$ and to $\tau(j)$ in $\rho(S_2)$ under our order-isomorphism. Suppose that the value of e in ρ is r . Consider the $r-1$ letters in $[l+L]$ which are less than r . Then

$$(r-1) - (\tau(j)-1) = r - \tau(j)$$

of those occur only in S_1 ,

$$(r-1) - (\tau(i)-1) = r - \tau(i)$$

occur only in S_2 , and

$$(r-1) - (r - \tau(i)) - (r - \tau(j)) = \tau(i) + \tau(j) - 1 - r$$

occur in both $\rho(S_1)$ and $\rho(S_2)$. Similarly, of the $l+L-r$ letters in ρ which are greater than r ,

$$(l+L-r) - (l - \tau(j)) = L - r + \tau(j)$$

occur only in $\rho(S_1)$,

$$(l+L-r) - (l - \tau(i)) = L - r + \tau(i)$$

occur only in $\rho(S_2)$, and

$$(l + L - r) - (L - r + \tau(i)) - (L - r + \tau(j)) = l - L + r - \tau(i) - \tau(j)$$

occur in both $\rho(S_1)$ and $\rho(S_2)$.

Thus, the number of sequences $\rho \in [k]^{2m-1}$ which are a union of two subsequences order-isomorphic to τ is

$$f(\tau, k) = \sum_{L=0}^{l-1} \binom{k}{l+L} \sum_{r=0}^{l+L} \sum_{i,j=1}^m [i-1, j-1]_{m-1} h(\tau, L, r, i, j),$$

where

$$h(\tau, L, r, i, j) = \binom{r-1}{r-\tau(i), r-\tau(j), \tau(i)+\tau(j)-1-r} \times \\ \times \binom{l+L-r}{L-r+\tau(i), L-r+\tau(j), l-L+r-\tau(i)-\tau(j)}.$$

Hence, the probability that a sequence $\rho \in [k]^{2m-1}$ is a union of two subsequences order-isomorphic to τ is $f(\tau, k)/k^{2m-1}$, so we have

$$\left[\binom{n}{2m-1} \right] E(X_\tau^2) = \frac{f(\tau, k)}{k^{2m-1}} \geq \frac{(2m-1)!}{(m-1)!^2} \binom{k}{l}^2 \frac{1}{k^{2m}},$$

or, equivalently,

$$kf(\tau, k) \geq \frac{(2m-1)!}{(m-1)!^2} \binom{k}{l}^2$$

for all positive integers k and all patterns $\tau \in [l]^m$. But both sides of this inequality are polynomials in k of degree $2l$, hence the same inequality should hold for their leading coefficients. The leading coefficient on the right is

$$\frac{(2m-1)!}{(m-1)!^2} \frac{1}{(l!)^2}.$$

On the left, k^{2l} only occurs when $L = l-1$. But then $\tau(i) + \tau(j) - 1 - r \geq 0$ and $l - L + r - \tau(i) - \tau(j) = r + 1 - \tau(i) - \tau(j) \geq 0$, so $r = \tau(i) + \tau(j) - 1$, and hence

$$h(\tau, L, r, i, j) = h(\tau, l-1, \tau(i) + \tau(j) - 1, i, j) = \\ = \binom{\tau(i) + \tau(j) - 2}{\tau(i) - 1} \binom{2l - \tau(i) - \tau(j)}{l - \tau(i)} = [\tau(i) - 1, \tau(j) - 1]_{l-1}.$$

Therefore,

$$[k^{2l}](kf(\tau, k)) = \frac{1}{(2l-1)!} \sum_{i,j=1}^m [i-1, j-1]_{m-1} [\tau(i) - 1, \tau(j) - 1]_{l-1},$$

so

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^m [i-1, j-1]_{m-1} [\tau(i)-1, \tau(j)-1]_{l-1} \geq \frac{(2m-1)!}{(m-1)!^2} \frac{(2l-1)!}{(l!)^2}.$$

Now, letting $m \leftarrow m+1$, $l \leftarrow l+1$, then $\bar{\tau}(i) \leftarrow \tau(i+1)-1$, we obtain the inequality (2). $\square$

Note that, for $l = 0$ (which includes the case $m = 0$), the inequality (2) becomes an equality. We conjecture, however, that the strict inequality holds if $l > 0$, i.e. if τ is not a constant string.

As in the case of patterns in permutations, it would be interesting to characterize the patterns $\tau \in [l]^m$, where the difference between the two sides of (2) is minimal.

We also note that the covariance $Cov(X_{\tau_1}, X_{\tau_2})$ of patterns $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in [l]^m$ is positive (resp. negative) if

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^m [i-1, j-1]_{m-1} [\tau_1(i)-1, \tau_2(j)-1]_{l-1} - \frac{(2m-1)!}{(m-1)!^2} \frac{(2l-1)!}{(l!)^2}$$

is positive (resp. negative). Hence, it would be interesting to characterize pairs of patterns $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in [l]^m$ based on the sign of the covariance $Cov(X_{\tau_1}, X_{\tau_2})$.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Herbert S. Wilf and Donald E. Knuth for their helpful suggestions.

References

- [1] M.H. Albert, M.D. Atkinson, C.C. Handley, D.A. Holton, W. Stromquist, On packing densities of permutations, *Electronic J. of Combinatorics* **9** (2002), #R5.
- [2] T. Amdeberhan, S.B. Ekhad, A condensed condensation proof of a determinant evaluation conjectured by Greg Kuperberg and Jim Propp, *J. of Comb. Theory, Ser. A* **78** (1997), 169–170.
- [3] G.H. Hardy, J.E. Littlewood, G. Pólya, “Inequalities”, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1934.
- [4] A. Price, Packing densities of layered patterns, Ph.D. thesis, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, 1997.